

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wopto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,523	06/15/2006	Kyung-Woo Lee	NEK0028US	1024
23413 CANTOR CO	7590 05/27/2010 I BURN I I P	0	EXAM	IINER
20 Church Street			YOUNG, MICAH PAUL	
22nd Floor Hartford, CT 0	06103		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
manora, er o			1618	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/27/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail  $\,$  address(es):

usptopatentmail@cantorcolburn.com

# Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)					
10/563,523	LEE ET AL.					
Examiner	Art Unit					
MICAH-PAUL YOUNG	1618					

	MICAH-PAUL YOUNG	1618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	ldress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  Extension of time may be availed under the proximis of 37 CFR 13 of  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the making date of this communication.  If NO period for rippi is specified above, the maximum statutory protein  Any rippi recived by the Office later than three months after the making  agained patter them digitations. See 37 CFR 1.740E.	TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		e merits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-82 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) 1-82 are subject to restriction and/or e			
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed onis/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	a 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 C	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)	s have been received. In have been received in Application of the comments have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage
Attachment(s)	»П.,		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	<ol> <li>Interview Summary</li> </ol>	(P1U-413)	

Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	Interview Summary (PTO-413)	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date	
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (FTO/SB/08)	Notice of Informal Patent Application	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) U Other:	

Art Unit: 1618

### DETAILED ACTION

#### Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1, 6-8, 11-15, 18 and 26-28, drawn to a method of making microcapsules comprising mixing a free-radically polymerizable and ethylenically unsaturated monomer, an emulsifier, an ultrahydrophobe, a hydrophobic material, an initiator and water to prepare a miniemulsion; followed by polymerizing the mini-emulsion to prepare microcapsules.

Group II, claim(s) 2-5, 9, 10, 16, 17, 19-25, and 29-82, drawn to a method of making microcapsules comprising mixing a free-radically polymerizable and ethylenically unsaturated monomer, an emulsifier, an ultrahydrophobe, a hydrophobic material, an initiator, a crosslinking agent and water to prepare a mini-emulsion; followed by polymerizing the mini-emulsion to form a crosslinked microcapsule.

The groups of inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The invention of group II will result in a crosslinked microcansule while the invention of

group I would not result in a crosslinked microcapsule. The microcapsules of each group would have separate physical properties and stabilities.

A telephone call was made to James Merrick on 5/16/10 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/563,523

Art Unit: 1618

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof. Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of

Art Unit: 1618

the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. <u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICAH-PAUL YOUNG whose telephone number is (571)272-0608. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:30; every other Friday off.

Art Unit: 1618

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Hartley can be reached on 571-272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618

/MICAH-PAUL YOUNG/ Examiner, Art Unit 1618